



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/014,114	12/11/2001	Vij Rajarajan	MS167414.2/40062.150USU1	3950

27488 7590 02/03/2005

MICROSOFT CORPORATION
C/O MERCHANT & GOULD, L.L.C.
P.O. BOX 2903
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2161

DATE MAILED: 02/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/014,114

Applicant(s)

RAJARAJAN ET AL.

Examiner

Hanh B Thai

Art Unit

2161

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on amendment November 17, 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This is in response to the after final amendment filed November 17, 2004. Claims 1-13 are examined and claims 14-20 are canceled.

Applicant's argument to the rejection under 35 USC § 112 is acknowledged. Consequently, the 112 rejection is withdrawn.

Applicant's amendment to claim 11 is not sufficient to overcome the rejection under 35 USC § 101. The newly added "displayable to a user on the network environment" does not require actual functional interrelationship of any data and computing process. Consequently, the 101 rejection is maintained.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-13 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

The claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claims 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they represent mere arrangement of data, do not define a functional interrelationship among that data and the computing process performed when reutilizing that data and as such do not implement a statutory process.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2161

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-2 and 7-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee (US 6,732,362).

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Lee discloses in a distributed network environment having a server computer system and a plurality of managed resources, each resource maintaining a plurality of objects, a method of representing at least one of the objects comprising:

- receiving a first schema document that conforms to a property sheet definition such that the first schema document defines a property sheet (col. 2, lines 32-49 and col.3, lines 20-23);
- receiving two or more second schema documents that conform to a page definition to define a plurality of pages, wherein at least one property page originates from a first resource and at least one property page originates from a second resource, wherein the first resource is a software resource the second resource is a hardware, and the second resource being different from the first resource (col.2, lines 32-49; col.3, lines 20-23 and lines 28-65). Lee discloses object classes contains attribute that defines aspects of the database, and thus reads on “schema documents”. Lee discloses at col. 3, lines 28-60 the “base class” contains properties in the form of object attributes and “Scope”, and thus reads on a property sheet. Lee discloses the “base class”, “Scope” and attribute values satisfy the requested condition to generate an object instance reads on

property page originates from a first resource (software resource). Lee discloses the Resource Installation Processor generates an object instance and transmits the exchanges to which the resource to be installed and Lee further discloses the “Resource Installation Request Message” reads on the Property Page originates from a second resource (hardware resource) because it contains information about the hardware resource to be installed, at the very least it holds identification information;

- modifying the property sheet to include the received pages; and wherein the property sheet represents the object (col.3, lines 36-38).

Regarding claims 2 and 8, Lee further discloses that the property sheet comprises object-type information applicable to objects of the same type, and wherein the property pages comprise resource-specific information (col. 2, lines 32-49 and col.3, lines 20-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 3-5, 9 and 11-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,732,362) in view of Calder (US 5,949,417).

Regarding claims 3 and 9, Lee discloses requesting the resources associated with the instance of the object to supply instance-specific information (col.2, lines 50-67). Lee, however, does not disclose display information related to an instance of an object; accessing the property

Art Unit: 2161

sheet related to the object-type of the instance of the object; displaying object-type information gleaned from the property sheet; using the property pages of the property sheet, displaying information related to resources associated with the instance of the object; and displaying received instance-specific information from the associated resources. Calder, on the other hand, discloses a dynamic property sheet system including these steps (abstract; col.2, lines 11-55; col.4, lines 50-55; col.6, lines 15-50; Fig.2-4 and corresponding text, Calder). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lee to include the claimed limitations as taught by Calder. The motivation of doing so would have been to allow a user to easily and efficiently exchange resource information (col.1, lines 54-67, Calder).

Regarding claim 4, Lee/Calder combination further discloses at least one property page includes a pointer to executable code on its associated resource for resolving a request for instance specific information (col. 2, lines. 11-31, Calder).

Regarding claim 5, Lee/Calder combination further discloses the code relates to a search engine on the associated resource (col. 2, lines. 50-67, Lee).

Regarding claim 11, Lee discloses in a network environment having multiple resources, a computer program product readable by a computer and having stored thereon a data structure, comprising:

Lee discloses at col. 3, lines 28-60 the “base class” contains properties in the form of object attributes and “Scope”, and thus reads on a property sheet. Lee discloses the “base class”, “Scope” and attribute values satisfy the requested condition to generate an object instance reads on property page associated with software resource. Lee discloses the Resource Installation Processor generates an object instance and transmits the exchanges to which the resource to be

Art Unit: 2161

installed and Lee further discloses the "Resource Installation Request Message" reads on the Property Page associated with hardware resource because it contains information about the hardware resource to be installed, at the very least it holds identification information.

Lee, however, does not disclose that the property sheet is displayable to a user on the network environment. Calder, on the other hand, discloses a dynamic property sheet system including these steps (abstract; col.2, lines 11-55; col.4, lines 50-55; col.6, lines 15-50; Fig.2-4 and corresponding text, Calder). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Lee to include the claimed limitations as taught by Calder. The motivation of doing so would have been to allow a user to easily and efficiently exchange resource information (col.1, lines 54-67, Calder).

Regarding claim 12, Lee/Calder combination further discloses the property sheet relates to object type information and wherein the property pages relate to resource-specific information (col. 2, lines 32-49 and col.3, lines 20-60, Lee).

Regarding claim 13, Lee/Calder combination further discloses wherein at least one property page includes a pointer to executable code on its associated resource for resolving a request for instance specific information (col. 2, lines. 11-31, Calder).

3. Claims 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee (US 6,732,362) in view of W3C "Extensible Markup Language (XML) 1.0."

Regarding claims 6 and 10, Lee discloses all of the claimed limitation as discussed above, except that the property sheet and property pages stored as XML.

W3C discloses the storage of metadata in the form of XML (Section 1, "Introduction" and Section 1.1 "Origin and Goals").

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art to apply XML to the property sheets in Lee. The motivation to combine is suggested by W3C which discloses that use of XML to metadata such as that in the property sheets of Lee provide many advantages including the ability to use ubiquitous Internet protocols, ease of use, and brevity (Section 1.1 "Origin and Goals").

Conclusion

4. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. Helgeson et al. (US 6,643,652) disclose method and apparatus for management data exchange among systems in network.

2. Jeffords et al. (US 6,233,623) disclose replicated resource management system for managing resources in a distributed application and maintaining a relativistic view of state.

3. Tanaka et al. (US 5,471,399) disclose network management system and network status display method.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

Art Unit: 2161

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-4029. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh B Thai
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

January 28, 2005


UYEN LE
PRIMARY EXAMINER